Case: 1:20-cv-00215-SRC Doc. #: 14 Filed: 10/18/21 Page: 1 of 2 PageID #: 226

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI SOUTHEASTERN DIVISION

SHERMAN GRIFFIN,)
Petitioner,))
v.) Case No. 1:20-cv-00215-SRC
MISSOURI DEPARTMENT)
OF CORRECTIONS,)
Respondent.)

Memorandum and Order

This matter comes before the Court on Petitioner Sherman Griffin's [13] Motion to Appoint Magistrate Judge and Counsel. In civil cases, a pro se litigant does not have a constitutional or statutory right to appointed counsel. *Ward v. Smith*, 721 F.3d 940, 942 (8th Cir. 2013); *see also Stevens v. Redwing*, 146 F.3d 538, 546 (8th Cir. 1998) (stating that "[a] pro se litigant has no statutory or constitutional right to have counsel appointed in a civil case").

Rather, a district court may appoint counsel in a civil case if the court is "convinced that an indigent [litigant] has stated a non-frivolous claim...and where the nature of the litigation is such that [the litigant] as well as the court will benefit from the assistance of counsel." *Patterson v. Kelley*, 902 F.3d 845, 850 (8th Cir. 2018). When determining whether to appoint counsel for an indigent litigant, a court considers relevant factors such as the complexity of the case, the ability of the pro se litigant to investigate the facts, the existence of conflicting testimony, and the ability of the pro se litigant to present his or her claim. *Phillips v. Jasper Cty. Jail*, 437 F.3d 791, 794 (8th Cir. 2006).

After reviewing these factors, the Court finds that the appointment of counsel is not warranted at this time. Petitioner has demonstrated, at this point, that he can adequately present

his claims to the Court. The Court will entertain future motions for appointment of counsel as the case progresses, if appropriate. At this time the Court denies, without prejudice, Petitioner's [13] Motion to Appoint Counsel.

Petitioner also moves to appoint a magistrate judge. Doc. 13. Because the deadline has passed for Petitioner to consent to jurisdiction by magistrate judge, the Court denies the motion. *See* 28 U.S.C. 636; 18 U.S.C. 3401; E.D.Mo. L.R. 2.08(a).

So Ordered this 18th day of October, 2021.

STEPHEN R. CLARK

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

SLR.CR